

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully present Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17-27 and 32-33 for examination in the RCE filed herewith. Claims 1, 2, 11, 13, 19, 21 and 25 have been amended herein to more clearly define the scope of the claimed invention. Additionally, Claims 3, 4, 14 and 26 have been canceled herein without prejudice to the filing of divisionals and/or continuations. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims and remarks presented herein overcome the Examiner's rejections in the Final Office Action dated June 30, 2008, in the parent application.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Naik. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Examiner reiterates his previous rejection based on the assertion that Naik teaches all the elements of the independent claims with the exception of "a second virtual machine". The Examiner submits, however, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a second virtual machine could run on the system. Applicants' strongly disagree.

Once again, Applicants respectfully highlight the differences between what is taught in Naik vs. what is being claimed herein. Naik describes a scheme to control a set of distributed resources in a grid network environment. (Naik, Abstract). Specifically, the present invention is directed to a virtualized host platform wherein only a portion of the platform resources are dedicated to a grid application while the remaining resources on the platform continue to be used by a user. Thus, as claimed in independent Claims 1, 11, 21 and 25, a second virtual machine is isolated from the grid virtual machine and configured to run applications other than the grid application. This provides the virtualized platform with a significant degree of security because the grid application is isolated from the other platform activity.

Applicants respectfully submit that the scheme as claimed herein is different from the scheme in Naik and would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on Naik. The focus in Naik is directed to controlling a set of distributed resources in a grid network environment. Naik does not, however, teach or suggest a

various elements claimed herein. For example, Naik does not teach or suggest a virtual machine capable of executing non-grid applications. Naik does describe that a virtual machine may run a grid application, but the platform in Naik makes no mention of other virtual machines running non-grid applications, as claimed. The Examiner submits that this would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to run non-grid applications on the same platform. Applicants disagree.

While virtualized environments are known to provide secure, isolated execution environments, there is nonetheless a risk to opening up a platform for external applications on a grid network. Thus, while grid networks were known and the features of virtualized environments were known, there was little to no understanding of utilizing these together. The scheme articulated herein (and claimed herein) describes the way in which a VMM may manage resources, per a typical virtualized host platform, while a resource manager may additionally monitor the activity in the grid VM and supplement resources and/or enforce policies. Naik does not teach or suggest these elements in combination and Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine virtualized platforms with grid networks.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 11, 21 and 25 and all claims dependent on these claims are patentable over Naik. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections to Claims 1, 2, 7-13, 17-25 and 27.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that pending 1, 2, 7-13, 17-25 and 27 are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this case. If the Examiner has any remaining questions, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (714) 730-8225.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 29, 2008

/Sharmini N. Green, Reg. No. 41,410/  
Sharmini N. Green  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
Registration No. 41,410  
(714) 730-8225